

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MATTHEW JONES,

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

CIVIL NO. JKB-25-0842

DISCOVER BANK, et al.,

*

Defendants.

*

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff Matthew Jones filed suit against 233 Defendants, including what appear to be various banks, business, churches, and medical facilities, among others. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff also filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. (ECF No. 2.) The Motion will be granted, and Plaintiff will be directed to show cause why the Court should not dismiss this action.

“[U]nder 28 U.S.C. § 1915, courts are required to screen a plaintiff’s complaint when in forma pauperis status has been granted.” *Harris v. Janssen Healthcare Prods.*, Civ. No. ELH-15-2730, 2015 WL 5897710, at *2 (D. Md. Oct. 6, 2015). Further, “[u]nder 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), the court must dismiss a plaintiff’s complaint if it fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Although pleadings filed by a self-represented plaintiff are to be liberally construed, the plaintiff’s complaint must contain factual allegations sufficient ‘to raise a right to relief above the speculative level’ and that ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Id.* (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

In short, Plaintiff fails to allege any cognizable cause of action against any of the Defendants. Plaintiff alleges, for instance, that:

In my lifetime, I have never seen a woman in public, in the whole USA. I have driven in travel from Delaware to Maine, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New

Jersey, New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Virginia, and West Virginia, and I have never seen anyone except myself who isn't a Police Brown of Black. I have only seen Males and She-Males, nearly all are hiding their appearance with Lobster-Caucasian DNA


(ECF No. 1 at 16.) The remainder of the Complaint is equally nonsensical. (*See generally id.*) 28 U.S.C. § 1915 “accords judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). “Examples of the latter class are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios,” *id.* at 328, such as the ones currently before the Court. The Court concludes that dismissal is appropriate here.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED;
2. The Clerk SHALL CLOSE this case; and
3. The Clerk is DIRECTED to MAIL a copy of this Memorandum and Order to Plaintiff.

DATED this 21 day of March, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "James K. Bredar", is written over a horizontal line.

James K. Bredar
United States District Judge